REMARKS

Claims 1-53 were pending in this application when the present Office Action was mailed on February 4, 2009. In this response, no claims have been amended or cancelled. Claim 54 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-54 are currently pending.

In the Final Office Action mailed on February 4, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-53 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. In particular:

A. Claim 1-6, 8-11, 23-29, 32-33, 38 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,416,705 to Barnett ("Barnett");

B. Claims 12 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Barnett;

C. Claims 7, 16-18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,499,025 to Middleton et al. ("Middleton");

D. Claims 14, 15, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Barnett in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,224,669 to Brame ("Brame");

E. Claims 19, 20, 22 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Barnett and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,475,594 to Oder et al. ("Oder").

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone interview on April 15, 2009, during which he and associate Jim Sfekas discussed the current rejection and the prior art. In particular, the Examiner agreed that the combination of claims 1 and 15 would overcome a Section 102 rejection based on Barnett. The foregoing and following remarks summarize and expand upon

the points discussed during the April 15 telephone interview. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this paper constitute applicants' interview summary. If the Examiner notices any deficiencies in this regard, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

The claims of the current application are directed to, *inter alia*, a method and system for displaying assistance messages to an aircraft operator. For example, the method of claim 1 includes receiving an input from an aircraft operator. A characteristic of the input (e.g. length, format) is then compared to a target value of the characteristic. If the characteristic differs from the target value by a more than a threshold amount, an assistance message is displayed. The assistance message includes "at least one of a complying input and an instruction for creating a complying input." An advantage of the disclosed method is that the system can detect an input error and provide immediate feedback to the aircraft operator on how to provide a correct input. This reduces the effort required to correct the error and allows the operator to better focus on the tasks of flying or navigating the aircraft.

Applicants have added new claim 54, which combines the features of claims 1 and 15, as discussed during the April 15 telephone interview. Applicants respectfully submit that Barnett fails to support a prima facie basis for rejecting new claim 54 under Section 102 for at least the reason that Barnett fails to disclose or suggest "providing a first assistance message if the input fails to comply with the target characteristic on a first basis" and "providing a second assistance message different than the first assistance message if the input fails to comply with the target characteristic on a second basis different than the first basis."

As discussed during the April 15 telephone interview, Barnett discloses a system for processing alphanumeric commands input to the scratch pad area of an aircraft control system. See Barnett, Abstract. After the user inputs the alphanumeric command, the system compares the input to a database of possible command codes.

See Barnett, col. 5, ln. 19-22. If the input matches a command code stored in CPU ROM, the system accepts the input and transmits the input to an active transponder. See Barnett, col. 5, ln. 22-26. If the input does not match a command code stored in CPU ROM, the system "writes an error code to LCD display 136" and then blanks the screen for reentry of a new alphanumeric sequence. See Barnett, col. 5, ln. 26-33. Thus, the system in Barnett only provides a single basis for determining that an input is invalid (i.e. whether the input matches a stored code). Barnett neither discloses nor suggests that the system provides "a first assistance message" and "a second assistance message" depending on a type of error detected by the system. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Barnett fails to disclose at least this feature of new claim 54 and request that claim 54 be allowed.

Turning to claim 1, Barnett also fails to support a prima facie basis for rejection under Section 102 for at least the reason that Barnett fails to disclose "if the characteristic of the input differs from the at least one target value . . . , displaying an **assistance** message" that includes "a complying input" or "an instruction for creating a complying input." As discussed above, the system in Barnett "compare[s] the alphanumeric entry with one of the valid codes stored in the CPU ROM." See Barnett, col. 5, lines 21-22. If the entry is not a valid code, the system outputs an "error code" to the LCD screen and then blanks the screen to receive a new input. See Barnett, Fig. 6, col. 5, lines 26-32. Barnett fails to disclose that the "error code" includes either "a complying input" or "an instruction for creating a complying input", as is included in claim 1. Instead, the system in Barnett provides only a simple error code that the aircraft operator must then de-code to understand. An operator who incorrectly inputs information to the Barnett system must either attempt to find the correct input through trial and error or leave other duties in order to look up the meaning of the error code. Thus, Barnett fails to disclose at least this feature of independent claim 1. The other cited references, including Brame, Middleton, and Oder, similarly fail to show at least this feature of claim 1. Therefore, for at least this reason, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Independent claims 24, 33, 38, and 49 include features generally analogous to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. Therefore, the Section 102 rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2-23, 25-32, 34-37, 39-48, and 50-52 depend from these independent claims. Therefore, these claims should be allowed for at least the foregoing reasons and for the additional features present in the claims.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 030048122US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 4, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

                                             By
                                             John M. Wechkin
                                                Registration No.: 42,216
                                             PERKINS COIE LLP
                                             P.O. Box 1247
                                             Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
                                             (206) 359-3257
                                             (206) 359-4257 (Fax)
                                             Attorney for Applicant